



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,447	11/20/2003	David M. Salcedo	C4-1114US (23336-18)	9828
7590	11/13/2006			
Dean D. Small The Small Patent Law Group LLP Suite 1611 611 Olive Street St. Louis, MO 63101			EXAMINER LAI, ANNE VIET NG ART UNIT 2612 PAPER NUMBER DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/718,447	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SALCEDO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Anne V. Lai	<b>Art Unit</b> 2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 44-62 and 65-88 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 44-62 and 65-88 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 44-50, 53-56, 59-62, 65-71, 74-76, 87 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Mottur** [US. 2004/0163118].

In claim 44, **Mottur** discloses a security system comprising:

a camera configured to generate a video signal (figs. 1, 7);

an object recognition system coupled to said camera and configured to receive said video signal (par. 12, 18, 24); and

a portable personal digital assistant (PDA) wirelessly coupled to said object recognition system and said camera, said PDA configured to control movement of said camera (par. 60-61, 64, 66, 69):

In claims 45-50, 53-55, Mottur discloses elements as claimed, for example: video recorder, display, detecting object entering surveillance area, identifying the object, alarm, etc. (figs. 1 and 7, par. 99, 104, 105).

In claims 56 and 59, Mottur discloses peripheral devices coupled to network for wireless communication with the PDA; for example, non camera device (par. 16), spotlights, antennas, gun, etc. (par. 37).

In claims 60-62, Mottur discloses at least one data collection device including a digital camera can be integrated or removable connected to the PDA (devices that can be integrated with or configured for compatible use with the user device; the user device can be a PDA; par 61).

In claims 65-71 and 74-76, **Mottur** discloses a method for operating the security system of claims 44-50, 53-56, 59-62 above. The rejections are of the same reasons as stated above.

In claim 87, **Mottur** discloses the PDA controls the pan, tilt, zoom movement of the camera (abstract, par. 8, 66, 69).

3. Claims 77-82, 85-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Monroe1** (previously provided).

In claim 77, **Monroe1** teaches a method of providing security information, comprising:

operating a camera to capture an image of an object (figs. 3-4, 8; par. 47, claims 1, 3-5);

comparing data representative of said object with stored data (facial recognition, par 143, claim 7);

providing a signal to a portable digital assistant (PDA) in response to said comparing step (43, fig. 4; claim 10); and

time stamping said signal (par. 45, 93, 152).

In claims 78-82, 84-85 **Monroe1** teaches video display, alarm, detecting and indicating entry of an object into a surveillance area, recording live video and saving an image file representative of the detected object, etc. ( par. 24-30, 36, 37, 170).

In claim 86, **Monroe1** teaches data collection device comprises a bar code scanner (par 272).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 44-50, 53-56, 59-62, 65-71, 74-76, 87 can also be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over **Monroe1** [US. 2004/0117638] (previously provided) in view of **Mottur** (see previous office actions combined with the control of camera movement of Mottur of the actions above).

6. Claims 51-52 and 71-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mottur** in view of **Swanson** [US. 5,689,442](previously provided).

In claims 51-52 and 71-72, **Mottur** discloses recording particular detected event (par 99) however does not disclose discarding recorded video segment that has data of no interest. **Swanson** teaches surveillance system that stores only events identified as events of interest and deletes information that no longer wanted to make room in

storage for subsequently captured information (abstract). In light of Swanson teaching, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art storing only the video segment of interest and discard the video segment that is not wanted for saving storage area and therefore reducing cost.

7. Claims 57-58 and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mottur** in view of **Monroe1** (previously provided).

In claim 57-58, **Mottur** fails to disclose a peripheral device comprises an access control system or a metal detector. **Monroe1** teaches a video surveillance system comprising peripheral devices in communication with PDA for access control, metal detection and alarm (par: 171-172, 260). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, installing a peripheral device of choice is based on the need of particular application.

In claim 88, **Monroe1** teaches time stamping the recorded video segment (par. 45, 152).

8. Claim 83 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Monroe1** in view of **Swanson**.

In claim 83, **Monroe1** does not disclose discarding recorded video segment that has data of no interest. **Swanson** teaches surveillance system that stores only events identified as events of interest and deletes information that no longer wanted to make room in storage for subsequently captured information (abstract). In light of Swanson teaching, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art storing only

the video segment of interest and discard the video segment that is not wanted for saving storage area and therefore reducing cost.

***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 44-62 and 65-86 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2612

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne V. Lai whose telephone number is 571-272-2974. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am to 6:30 pm, Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hofsass Jeffery can be reached on 571-272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AVL  
10/30/06

  
JEFFERY HOFSSASS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600